6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

a fiction. Lacking means of physical enforcement because of the lack of a centralized political system, common action could take place only among those who voluntarily agreed. But when small bands of mounted warriors imposed their rule over the multitudes of non-warlike peasantry, the power-oriented conquerors made use of the Old-Slavonic system of unanimity for purposes of regimentation and governmentalization from above. That is, they imposed a dictated consensus by means of force else the opposition of the peasant majority would soon have deprived the ruling minority of its power.

In this manner a number of band chieftains of nomadic origin ruled groupings of small peasant communities, in the form of manorial principalities. Each one of these local potentates, even though Slavicized in speech or born in mixed families, still exhibited extreme self-seeking characteristics and cherished personal power and aggrandizement above everything else, a tenet that had characterized his nomadic predecessors. Each, therefore, following steppe traditions, had a scheme of his own; each was interested primarily in accumulating riches for himself and his immediate family. In consequence, these local princes and their war bands constantly intrigued and fought among themselves. They also transferred their personal and factional strifes to the neighboring towns of burghers. In these squabbles and struggle for power and expansion, the feuding princes and fighting factions did not hesitate to call on the common enemies in their neighborhoods, such as the steppe marauders or the Viking pirates to come in and help them defeat their opponents.

It was in the course of such an internecine strife (*vsta rod na rod*) in Novgorod region in the middle of the ninth century that a band of Scandinavian merchant-pirates was called on to come and help one clique of native princes against the other.[18] These "Varangians" not only came in but stayed, founding later the Russian state in the Dnieper river basin, at that time the most important merchant thoroughfare in that part of the world. These Norse conquerors and state builders were soon assimilated by the natives. In the course of time a series of new principalities was formed and old factional bickerings and fratricidal warfare was renewed.[19]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

therefore were leaving the land to move to the cities or to join the bandits as traders and warriors.

These bandit-warriors are pictured in the Russian folk epic as ruling by such terrifying violence and dreadful terror and craft that all the living beings on the earth flee and hide, or lie prostrate, and even the earth itself shrinks and the sun sinks away at their appearance:

> The red sun was sinking
> Behind the dark woods, behind the broad sea,
> Multitudes of stars studded the clear sky
> When Lord Volga Buslavlevich was born
> In holy Russia.
> When Volga Buslavlevich was five years of age,[27]
> Lord Volga Buslavlevich went forth over the damp earth
> Damp mother earth was rent,
> The wild beasts fled away up to the clouds;
> And the fish scattered in the blue sea:
> And Lord Volga Buslavlevich went
> To learn all craft and wisdom,
> All the various languages;[28]
>
> Volga grew in strength and stature.
> He chose for himself a bold druzhina,
> Of thirty youths save one,
> He, Volga making the thirtieth.
> His dear 'uncle' bestowed upon him,
> Gracious Vladimir of Royal Kiev,
> Three cities with their peasants.[29]

The hero knights of these legendary *Byliny* (the events of the olden days) when they find themselves in circumstances which appear to be under their control, are likely to be boastful, quarrelsome, disrespectful, sensitive to rank and inclined to belittle the strength of their adversaries. In such circumstances they spend their time either in plundering, fighting, maiming and killing, or in feasting, debauchery, and drunkenness.[30]

The extreme power-compulsion and delusions of grandeur of these supermen, as well as their complete lack of self-control, are well symbolized in folk narratives about Svyatogor. This hero has an irresistible urge to bring the heaven and the earth to-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia . RF1

gether and to subdue the whole of the universe to his personal control. But he is at the same time utterly incapable of controlling his own gigantic strength. Hence he provokes the whole earth against himself ("Mother Earth could not bear his weight"):

> He saddled his heroic steed
> And rode forth on his way.
> His young heart was throbbing,
> His strength vibrated in his sinews,
> His energy was like to overflow,
> And he was heavily burdened with his strength,
> Heavily burdened as with a grievous load;
> He could not control his heroic strength.
> And he threw away his steel club
> Which vanished out of sight about the clouds,
> And caught it again in his white hand;
> "If I should take to walking on the earth
> I would fasten a ring to heaven,
> I would bind an iron chain to the ring,
> I would drag the sky down to mother earth
> I would turn the earth on its end,
> And I would confound earth with heaven."[31]

There is no deed that these warriors and bandits would hesitate to commit in order to increase their personal power. The Great-Russian folk narratives agree with the early Russian chronicles and with later Russian historical documents that these men were ready to murder even their own closest kin in order to achieve their personal aims. In a folk epic this extreme bloodthirstiness and quest for power is symbolized by young Shchelkun, a hero of Tartar origin who murders his own son, and then, like the Scythians of old, drinks his blood. By this act of extreme cruelty he seeks his own self-aggrandizement:

> Stab your son
> Your beloved son,
> Fill a bowl of his blood,
> Drink up this blood,
> This warm blood,
> And then I will grant you

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

538
152
272

Tver the ancient,
Tver the wealthy,
And the two brothers,
The two bold Borisovichi.
At once young Schelkun
Stabbed his son,
Filled a bowl of his blood,
His warm blood,
And drank up the bowl of that warm blood:
And straightway Tsar Azvych
Bestowed upon him
Tver the ancient,
Tver the wealthy,
And the two brothers,
The two bold Borisovichi.[34]

However, as soon as such "Good bold youths who have robbed and slain" find themselves in circumstances which appear to be unsurmountable, they are inclined to become cowardly, are overwhelmed with gloom and fear, and tend to rely on crouching servility and on guile and cunning as a means of self-preservation. When in such a mood they picture their enemies as superhuman, beastly beings possessing supernatural strength, thus justifying the lack of fair play in dealing with them.

178
754

It is possible that this radical change of social structure was projected into the new folk concept of the supernatural world. The Old-Slavonic fairyland inhabited predominantly by benevolent spirits was apparently transformed under the new conditions into a demonland full of beings with terrifying and macabre qualities. Blood-sucking vampires, heart-devouring witches, fiends that feast on human flesh, and other murderous and rapacious beings similar to those found in the underworld of the steppe nomads replaced the Old-Slavonic helpful deities and moderately malignant spirits.

In the same manner the Old-Slavonic benevolent wizards apparently evolved into rapacious and slaughterous witches who specialize in child eating. The Old-Slavonic beautiful and benevolent water spirits developed into monsters who bewitch people, especially the youths, and then draw them down into the deep waters to put them to death. The Old-Slavonic friendly and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

God a wrathful, irate and revengeful Old Man, but the Church leaders themselves, affected by the conditions of their society, were inclined to emphasize the fear aspect of the Christian God rather than his love and compassion. They also tended to preoccupy themselves with death, describing it as a terror-striking event. In some early Church sermons even the messengers of God, the angels, were represented in a terrifying manner:

> Then, two angels appear, sent by God for the soul. As soon as the soul has seen them, it will be horrified; all its image and beauty and face will change; feet and hands will be torpid, and the hearing as with the tongue will be chained by silence; and man will be all sorrowful and invalid and woeful; and afterwards, appears death. And then, with a terrible pain the soul will issue from the body . . .[37]

These feelings of anxieties and fears, combined perhaps with a strong sense of guilt of the Church leaders, are manifested in the life histories of most Russian saints. These people, as portrayed in their hagiographies, were being constantly threatened by temptations and intimidations of dreadful demons. Hallucinations about demons became very frequent among the monks, and struggle against demons became one of the main aspects of ascetic life. Whole herds of these fiends were sometimes seen by the ascetics. The demons would disguise themselves as humans, as angels, and even as Christ, or they would appear in their true beastly form.[38]

Consistent with this gloomy and terrifying view of life and death was also an apocalyptic picture of the end of the world as pictured by Church leaders. According to the old Russian sermons the end of the world was very near and it was to ensue in fire and floods of blood brought about by a wrathful and revengeful God, (a picture that strongly reminds one of the vision of the end of the world found in the beliefs of the steppe nomads of Central Asia):

> Then undying fire will flow from the East to the West, devouring mountains, stones, trees, and the sea. The firmament will be dried up and turned like brick bats, and all existing things, except men, will melt in a like way by the rate of the fire. All the earth will be burned; and through this undying fire all mankind has to pass.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

562 369 middle and upper strata knew how to assert themselves and increase their role and influence, thus reviving the Old-Slavonic traditions.

III

593 152 Though the father was to be severe and strict, he was expected also to love his wife and his children. Just like God in Heaven, father's duty was to inflict harsh punishment, but he was also to show compassion, kindness, understanding and constant solicitude for the members of his household. He was responsible before God and men for the failings and misdeeds of his family members, and he was therefore to look after their well-being and salvation. Thus love and violence were often mingled in the Great-Russian family. A number of folk sayings express this ambivalent trait of attachment and hostility when referring to the attitudes and behavior of the father. "To love one's wife is to hold her in terror" (*Lyubit zhenu-derzhat grozu*); "Whom I love I thrash" (*Kovo lyublyu togo i biyu*).[24]

One of the basic underlying motives in the father's violence seems to have been his self-seeking and urge for dominance as well as a need for succor. "Beat your wife oftener, it will be useful for the future," the men would say. The Domostroy justifies child beating in a similar manner ". . . he will comfort you in your old age and will give beauty to your soul. . . . and he will make you happy when he grows up. . . . and your enemies will envy you. If you will be weak in his childhood, he will make you suffer when he grows up; will set your soul on edge."[25]

There is in some proverbs also an indication of an expectation of "masochistic" indulgence according to which violence and deprivation would arouse love. "Not to beat one's wife is not to be loved by her" (*zhenu ne bit i milu ne byt*),[26] the people would say. In a folk song, for instance, the husband buys gifts for his wife, but it is of no avail. When the husband buys a knut and gives his wife a beating with it, it is only then that she responds with love. In another folk song the wife boasts the knuting "is an honor to me and is not painful" (*Mne to za chest, ne bolno.*)[27]

Though the father felt dependent upon his wife and children

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

and was expected to love his family, he was to remain detached and distant. Such paternal behavior was particularly noticeable in the urban strata where both the Turco-Mongol and the Church influences were stronger. "Do not smile at him, do not play with him" is the advice of the Domostroy concerning father-son relations.[28] The father was not supposed to show any outward signs of emotion, neither anger nor affection toward his wife, children, or his servants. Even during the beating the father was expected to remain cold and detached, according to the Domostroy. His love was to be of a charitable and compassionate character. Any kind of personal closeness and familiarity with his wife or children might have undermined an authority that was based on sternness, fear and awe.

A number of autobiographies and other writings of Russian men of letters, as well as the accounts given by foreign observers, stress this duality in the behavior of the father. He is pictured as compassionate, kind and goodhearted, but also as detached, harsh and abusive.[29] A number of these documents tell about the *groza* (terror) in which the father or the grandfather had held all his dependents; about his detachment even when playing with children, and about his inability to be with them on comradely terms or to laugh with them. They often tell about the difficulties the children experienced in attempting to approach their father on intimate and friendly terms, though they felt that he had a "good heart" and was "compassionate":

> My father, true to the family tradition, took up the profession of soldiering . . . To his children he was a comparative stranger but we were terrified of him. We only saw him at meals; he spent the rest of his time in his private rooms which none of us dared to enter save at his command. A masterful, violent nature, he either could not or would not control his temper, and was an object of terror to us and to his servants. However, he had a good heart. But at the period when he lived, harshness had become a moral principle. To show benevolence was to be weak, to be cruel was to be strong . . . and my father, like most men, was cast in the mould of his period. He carefully concealed his feelings under a mask of harshness. He was certainly brutal; he was also compassionate in his own way . . . At this period children, the poor and the weak, and still more the serfs, were scarcely considered to possess a soul. My father reigned, but did not govern.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

desire for his father's death.[17] Only then was there hope for freedom. A folk maxim, for instance, says: "When the earth takes the parents, the children get their freedom." Such an extreme form of revolt, however, was not so simple because it went counter to the accepted image of the father, his supernaturally sanctioned absolute power, his care and solicitude for the welfare of all the family, and the traditional obligation of love and gratitude towards him on the part of the family members. Hence antagonistic attitudes against the father were regularly mixed with strong feelings of guilt.

Both the feeling of guilt and the fear of being rejected by the father might have perhaps been manifested in those folk tales which tell gruesome and frightful stories about children who were abandoned by their parents[18] and left at the mercy of wild beasts, frost, open sea, and in those folk tales in which the children are dismembered by their own parents and thrown away in small pieces. That the father himself sensed a potential feeling of rebelliousness on the part of his son and that he himself might have had a feeling of guilt because of his treatment of his son is witnessed by folk sayings which express a dread of old age with its dependency upon one's own children: "To pay old debts and to feed old parents are the hardest things in the world"; "One father will feed nine children sooner than nine children will feed one father"; "God take away my life rather than let me be under my son's care."[19]

There were other tensions and conflicting situations in the Great-Russian patriarchal family, particularly in the urban strata. The principle of seniority, for instance, reserved disciplinary privileges and responsibilities for the brothers in relation to their sisters, and for the senior brothers and sisters in relation to their juniors. At the same time a father's absolute power often took the form of favoritism in respect to a younger son, or to a daughter, which was counter to the established principles of seniority and therefore considered unjust. There was therefore plenty of opportunity for resentments, rivalries, jealousies, hatreds, and fights among the siblings, or between the older and the younger family members:

& Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Dobrolyubov]

humiliating treatment which Dobrolyubov experienced at the hands of his father. As a reaction to such a family situation, Dobrolyubov developed strong needs for emotional attachment and felt very disillusioned and deeply embittered when his need for dependency was frustrated. When he was sixteen years of age this "forerunner of Bolshevism" wrote in his diary:

> No matter how many attachments I had formed in the past, always the evil fate would whisk the beloved being far away from me; and in my soul remains only the sorrowful memory and bitter realization of my despair . . . I could never live without love, without attachment to someone. This has been so ever since I remember myself. But this constant irony of fate, which makes all my hopes and dreams usually crash into dirt, constantly hardens and chills my heart, and there is nothing surprising in the fact that soon it will be both hard and cold as stone.[5]

Later, apparently, Dobrolyubov found an outlet for his repressed hostilities, in his writings in which he tended to emphasize the dark sides of Russian society ("Realm of Darkness"). He joined that group of "Nihilists" who excelled in their philosophy of extreme individualism, who attacked the existing society and devised the ways to destroy "coldbloodedly" its very foundations, including the family. It was in this ideology of "Nihilism" that Russian Anarchism as well as Bolshevism have been rooted.

The demand for unlimited power as a means of compensation for humiliations and deprivations and as a means of satisfying craving for acceptance and support tends to perpetuate a political system which gives one a chance to indulge such needs through relationships of absolute dominance and unconditional submission and through destructive action. Such a social and political structure, in its own turn, tends to reinforce paternal despotism and absolute obedience in the family. In this manner, just as in the society of steppe marauders, power-seeking, mistrust and destructive aggression are perpetuated, become generalized and are manifested in many social relations.

On the folk level desire for power was manifested, for instance, in the customs connected with childbirth. On that occasion the midwife would place the child on a sheepskin coat or furcoat so

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

that he might be rich and powerful in life.[6] For the same reason money was placed in the water when the child was bathed for the first time.[7]

In marriage customs the urge for power was expressed in certain activities performed during the marriage ritual and believed to contain magical properties that enabled either one or the other spouse to dominate. Also in the wedding party the bridegroom was called "knyaz" (prince) and his party "boyars"; an important part of the marriage ceremonies consisted in *velichat gostei*, that is in mutual glorification of the wedding guests.

The phrase *Kak vas velichat?*—how to glorify you?, which is employed when asking another person his name might indicate the same feelings. In early Russia personal names were formed by a combination of words which conveyed the image of rule, glory, power, holiness and destruction, such as Sviatoslav (the holy and glorious), Yaropolk (blazing power), Mstislav (the glory of revenge).

Another manifestation of power-seeking, mistrust and destructive aggression on the folk level is revealed, for instance, in attitudes toward women. The folk image of the woman is in remarkable contrast to the image of the mother. The derisive name for woman is *baba*, and baba is said "not to be a human being" (*Baba ne chelovek*), according to a proverb. Therefore mistreatment and abuse of women may be justified.[8] In the folk parlance distinction is made between *Krestyane* (Christians, peasants) and *zhenshchiny* (women). In the folk maxims women are pictured as immoral ("Three babas Sodom"), shameless ("A baba laughs where grandpa blushes"), more cunning than the devil ("Where the devil fails he sends a baba"), the cause of all man's troubles ("She was the cause of Adam's banishment"), and source of all evil ("We cannot expect any good from our rib").[9]

This folk concept of woman as an inferior being is found on all levels of Russian society. Comparatively few women have been admitted to the rank of saints in the Russian Church. Count Leo Tolstoy, a philosopher and novelist, who has been otherwise renowned for his ideas of Christian love, all-human brotherhood and an anarchic social and political equality, showed a great deal of misogynism. In his diary he pictures

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

women as stupid and nasty, conceited and licentious, and as the mainspring of all calamities of the world.[10] But Tolstoy, too, like the Russian popular view of life, did make a distinction between the woman and the mother.[11]

Hostile drives, mistrust and destructive aggression might be revealed also in attitudes towards strangers. These are sometimes likened to animals, especially dogs. Comparing people with beasts indicates an inclination to abase them and to mistreat them. Such an attitude is shown especially toward those who are considered to be "enemies." When talking about the Tartars, the people would say "the dog of a Tartar." In a like way, xenophobia was manifested in the attitudes toward the "thrice accursed Latins," that is, the Western, non-Orthodox peoples.

Perhaps this need to abuse and to destroy in order to demonstrate one's power was manifested also in treatment of those who were abandoned and helpless, such as prisoners in foreign wars, as well as prisoners in rebellions and civil wars at home, or convicted criminals. In the rebellions and civil wars atrocities were committed by both sides, the government troops and the rebels, the Orthodox and the Dissenters, the Whites and the Reds. In a similar manner convicted criminals, domestic servants and serfs were often used as targets of destructive aggression.

Tendency to abuse was manifested also in the relations between merchants and customers, capital and labor. In the lowest strata ruthless self-seeking took also the form of begging. There was a great number of beggars; begging became a widely spread business. Some of the beggars became people of considerable means. Leaders among the beggars would mutilate, deprive of eyesight, and deform healthy men and boys to use them as their instruments in begging. Entire villages, and even some regions were said to have made begging their regular profession.[12]

II

In circumstances where power-seeking, destructive aggression and mistrust prevail any accident may be interpreted as a sign of another person's hostile intentions. The other person tends to be looked upon as a potential enemy. "You mustn't stroke anyone's head—you might get your hand bitten off," said Lenin.[13] And as

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

000 a self-protection on any sign of hostility a preventive war or feud must be initiated.[14] Hence also craftiness and cunning, readiness to lie and to commit perjury[15] and a general wiliness and wariness might easily develop.[16] When a society is to a large extent governmentalized and regimented, such traits are reinforced because in such conditions the feeling of insecurity and lack of trust favor ruthless domineering and coercive submission on all levels of social organization.

In circumstances where power-seeking, extreme self-concern and lack of mutual trust prevail there is a readiness of many people to spy on one another and to inform. There is also an inclination to caluminate[1] as a means of revenge and personal malice.

● 152 154 Destructive aggressiveness and feeling of insecurity, as well as need for succor, may explain the passion for hazardous games and intoxicating drink, and the inclination toward lechery. That [273] liquor is used as a compensatory device which provides a feeling of power and security as contrasted to a reality in which one is cowed into submission is well expressed in folk philosophy. According to a proverb, "When the peasant is drunk, he feels equal to a nobleman; when he is sober he is afraid even of a pig."[17] Hence, in a society in which people find themselves subdued, degraded, and oppressed and where their needs for attachment and acceptance are thwarted, a safe way to rebel against such conditions or to find a convenient substitute may be in drunkenness and debauchery. The early Church documents, as well as the recent evidence, point to the perseverance of such practices:

[786] Numerous are the sermons devoted to invectives against drunkenness and the pagan character of banquets . . . This wild debauch of popular feasts was preserved until the twentieth century, with the same scenes of drunken fighting and killing as are depicted in this document of the thirteenth century. Orgiasm . . . unrestrained emotional [781] outbursts, stimulated by alcohol, dancing, fighting, or sex, always has been an outstanding feature of Russian temperament.[18]

1 [Sic -- Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

[Saint Theodosius]

593 159 792 rified by such behavior. After his father's death, Theodosius used "to go to the fields with the slaves and work humbly."[13] Later when Theodosius finally escaped from his mother's tyranny by entering a monastery, he became the founder of that school of Russian monastic philosophy which emphasizes self-abnegation and meekness, as well as charitable love and compassion for those who suffer. In that manner Theodosius identified himself and his Church with all those who were tyrannized. But he was also active in protecting those to whom injustice was done. He became "intercessor for many before judges and princes, rescuing people."[14]

152 695 Deep sympathy for those who suffer and identification with them might explain why the Russian juries and the peasant courts were so ready to acquit the repentants. Juries and courts would often set free criminals who were found guilty by well established evidence. The verdict in such a case might be "not guilty" because of "commiseration for the poor murderer." A jury sitting through Holy Week would tend to acquit everybody, because "at the time of our Lord's Passion, it does not become Christians to condemn their brethren."[15]

152 538 Sympathy for those who suffer and identification with them is an outstanding trait of Russian literature of the nineteenth and early twentieth centuries. Russian writings of those days exhibit a preoccupation with great social, political, religious and psychological problems of mankind. They picture a gloomy, painful, and tragic world, full of misery, injustice, blood and death. In the same manner the school textbooks of those days contained many heartbreaking stories full of compassion and commiseration for the suffering, unprotected, weak.

152 783 538 668 When identification with suffering is a manifestation of revolt or is combined with the urge for revolt, strong feelings of guilt might develop. On such grounds compulsion to suffer and to be persecuted might thrive. This "Russian Kenotism" is found among the early Russian monastics[16] as well as among the Russian nineteenth century revolutionaries and men of letters. Some Russian revolutionary factions, for instance, emphasized sacrifice and martyrdom to the point of self-destruction.[17] In the like manner Count Leo Tolstoy claims in his diary that he, "often

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

wanted to suffer, wanted persecution."[18] A number of heroes in Dostoyevsky's novels show the same urge.

Undoubtedly such feelings contributed to that tone of fanaticism and that readiness for self-sacrifice which was characteristic of many Russian revolutionaries and conspirators of pre-Soviet days and which gave a special vigor and intensity to their activities. Such extremes in emotional reactions were supported also by another trait in these people, that of emotional instability.

13
EMOTIONAL INSTABILITY

I

FEAR and awe (*strakh*), submission (*povinovenie*), and sense of guilt (*sovest*) are rooted in the structure of the Great-Russian society and are supported by its traditions. But so is compassion (*zhalost*), humility (*smirenie*), demand for truth and justice (*pravda*) and for egalitarian acceptance, as well as revolt and terror (*ustrashenie*), lack of trust and urge to destroy (*unichtozhenie*). It is the propensity to experience such contrasting sentiments that causes behavior which is alternatively bent in opposite directions. A person's behavior which has been conditioned by an environment which fosters such feelings and attitudes might show a lack of sense of moderation and a tendency toward extremes in responses to his social milieu.

It is such unbalanced peculiarities of behavior that have drawn the attention of many students and observers of Russian society.[1] A tendency toward diametrically opposite extremes, and frequent alternation between these poles has been often noticed. Kindliness and gentleness have alternated with lack of consideration, excessive severity, brutality and cruelty. Rebelliousness has been followed by resignation. Periods of feverish energy and confidence have been superseded by spells of inertia, languor and despair. Extremes in feasting have alternated with extremes in fasting. Tyrannical rule had its counterpart in demands for

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

absolute and unconditional liberty and denial of any laws, conventions or obligations.[2] Ideologies which sought universal salvation and identification with Christ's teaching (Dissent, Slavophilism) had their counterparts in the ideologies which demanded universal destruction and identification with anti-Christ (Nihilism, Terrorism).[3]

Among the intelligentsia a lack of a sense for methodical work, and lack of initiative were combined with preoccupation concerning grandiose and utopian plans on a world scale. There was a noticeable lack of preparation for these programs and a tendency to consider that having made plans was equal to their fulfillment. Such traits were so striking among some intelligentsia that they were given a special name (*Oblomovshtina*).[4]

It is known that a number of outstanding Russian intellectuals have shown a remarkable lack of emotional balance in their behavior. These would often move from one ideological camp into that of their bitter opponents. In ideological controversies no tolerance was shown for the opposite point of view. There was a tendency to treat all in the opposite camp as enemies. "Who is not with us is against us," was the principle applied in theory and practice. Some outstanding Russian intellectuals themselves admitted such traits in their character. Dostoyevsky, for instance, analyzing his own feelings stated: "In all things I go to the uttermost extremes; my life long I have never been acquainted with moderation." Not unlike this self-analysis of Dostoyevsky was that of Bakunin. In his "Confession to the Czar" he said: "There was in my character a radical defect: love for the fantastic, for out-of-the-way, unheard of adventures, for undertakings which open up an infinite horizon and whose end no man can foresee."[5]

According to General Golovine among the army officers there was a "tendency to drunkenness, churlishness and tyranny toward their subordinates," but there were also "many heroes among these negative types," and often a "regular officer showed such readiness to sacrifice himself that his superiors were forced to restrain his excessive ardor."[6] Lack of balance and stability was also reflected in the differences between military units. Often "next to a first class regiment there was another completely worthless."[7]

CONTINUED
ON
NEXT FICHE

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

157 538 his power over others, so unshakable is his belief in his own sovereignty. . . . There is tremendous strength in *Boris Godunov*, the part I would sooner play than any of the others of my repertory. Here again the Russian temperament is overwhelmingly manifest in the seditious license of the boyars, as it is in the boundless autocracy of Ivan the Terrible. It appears also in the lawlessness and drunkenness of Prince Galitski, one of the chief characters of Borodin's admirable opera *Prince Igor*. Galitski's excesses are as extreme as his cynicism.[9]

157 533 Some observers of Great-Russian music find in it traits similar to those of Great-Russian belles-lettres. According to Leroy-Beaulieu the Great-Russian music shows an "alternation between extreme emotionality and extreme peacefulness."[10] And according to General Golovine this music is a "combination of the vague and salient softness and harshness of sound, deep sorrow and uncontrolled gaiety, dreams and drama, restlessness and calm . . ."[11] Golovine specifically referred to the music of Glinka, Chaikovsky, Borodin, Rimsky-Korsakoff, and Rachmaninoff.

● 152 538 Extremes of self-aggrandizement followed by self-maceration, murder followed by tears, is noticeable also in the Russian folk psychology. The Great-Russian folk songs, for instance, are often full of cruelty, but are also heart-breaking and plaintive, full of sadness, melancholy and tragedy, sung in minor key. In folk tales and folk songs about Stenka Razin, this robber-bandit is represented both as magnanimous and cruel, as savage and pitiful. He revolted against those in authority, but rallied the poor and rebellious beneath his banner. At the same time he himself showed traits of barbarism and of self-laceration. One of the popular Russian folk songs, tells us, for instance, how once Stenka, "drunk with wine and mirth together," lifted the Persian Princess, his beloved "new-vow bride," over the side of his barque and flung her "forth into the hungry deep" of the Volga, as "a gift from a Cossack of the Don." Stenka acted in such a violent manner because some of his comrades had scornfully reproached him that in his affection to his bride he behaved like a *baba* (woman).

II

152 154 A number of interpretations are offered for such behavior.[12] Most of these explanations are either "geografic" or "cultural-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

diffusionist" in their general approach. Thus a number of writers attribute the ambivalent traits in Russian behavior to the influence of climate. The struggle with hostile forces of nature, say these people, has developed in the Russian man qualities of tenacity, energy, and strength; but at the same time the insuperable forces of nature have developed qualities of patience, resignation, and meekness. The former has developed hardness of character by the very bitterness of the struggle; the latter has taught him to sympathize with the afflicted and desolate.[13]

Other geographic theories point out not only the extremes in climate, but the contrasting nature of the soil as well, as a means to explain Russian behavior and Russia's life and history which are full of contrasts and contradictions. Russia's forest and marshy area is contrasted to the steppe regions as the basic foundations on which Russian society has grown.[14]

There are other students of Russia who tend to explain unbalanced traits in the Russian man on the ground of conflicting Asiatic and European cultural influences, to which Russia has been subjected throughout many centuries of its formation. This view is still shared by many. It had been advanced by a number of Russian intellectuals, among them Leo Tolstoy:

> One *Rus* has its roots in a universal, or at least in European culture. In this *Rus* the ideas of goodness, honor and freedom are understood as in the West. But there is another *Rus:* the *Rus* of the dark forests, the *Rus* of the Taiga, the animal Russia, the fanatic Russia, the Mongol-Tartar Russia. This last Russia made despotism and fanaticism its ideal. . . . Kiev *Rus* was a part of Europe, Moscow long remained negation of Europe.[15]

It would be difficult however to explain ambivalence in the behavior of individuals and peoples exclusively on the basis of such generalized influences of East and West, extremes in climate, and contrasts between forests and steppes. The circumstances which become significant as agents in personality formation have to be felt directly or indirectly on a number of levels of interpersonal and institutional relationships. Among these one of the more effective influences which shape and mold the personality of man seems to be the family environment.

Some Russian intellectual leaders and men of letters, such as

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

large part of them were disfranchised as well, because in municipal self-government and in district and provincial assemblies even persons holding university degrees, if they did not own a sufficient amount of property, were devoid of the right of suffrage.[4] And it was this underprivileged group of declassee nobility, of priests' sons, of former clerics, of sons and daughters of lower government employees, of unemployed professionals, of students and of former students who never had a chance to finish their studies, that became known as the *raznochintsy*.

The raznochintsy intelligentsia tended to lead a bohemian life and to engage in literary activities and journalism. But these vocations were greatly limited because of strict censorship laws. When the bar was established some raznochintsy practiced law as barristers, though they were very restricted in their activities because of traditional extra legal practices of the police. When under local self-administration (*Zemstvo*), a health, educational, and economic program for the improvement of rural areas was developed, a number of raznochintsy were employed by the Zemstvo as physicians, veterinarians, agronomists, teachers and bookkeepers. At the same time, their traditions and training, and especially their ambitions and expectations had conditioned the raznochintsy for intellectual pursuits and political leadership, not for routine administrative work or for business promotion and enterprise.

In such a situation the deeply rooted feeling of rejection which had been developed on the family level was greatly magnified.[5] Accordingly, self-centeredness, power-seeking, lack of trust, destructive aggression, as well as identification with suffering which were developed on the family level were heightened in these circumstances and found expression in ideologies which manifested extreme hostility and an urge for universal destruction. Many of these young rebels, for instance, denied all existing social institutions, conventions and restrictions, and demanded their total obliteration.

This ideology of extreme negation and destruction ("Nihilism") manifested, perhaps, the feelings of utter despair of the ambitious and self-seeking raznochintsy who felt impotent before the God-like power of the Czar and his omnipotent police.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

Thwarted in their drive for power and political leadership, these young men and women gave vent to their feelings of deprivation in phantasies and plans of destruction and death.

Much of the sadness, tragic sarcasm, morbidity and preoccupation with death and suffering which dominated Russian literature in the second part of the nineteenth century reflects such moods of despair. The predominance of social and political themes in the literary creations of these people and the insistence of literary critics of those days on literary "realism," that is, that a work of art should be judged not by artistic and esthetic criteria but by its portrayal of existing life and its faithfulness to reality, especially the brutal and dark reality, manifested the same feelings.

Pisarev, describing this psychological reaction of impotence and the urge for destruction before seemingly uncontrollable forces, stated that when men "find it impossible to transform life, their anger at their own impotence makes itself felt in the sphere of thought, where the destructive work of criticism proceeds unceasingly."[6] That the basic drive behind this urge for negation and destruction was extreme self-seeking is witnessed by some other ideas of the same writer. "Every living being," said Pisarev, "is for himself the center and the meaning of the universe . . . his personal joys, vexations, aspirations, and cares, are more important than universal revolutions. . . ."

Starting with such premises, some of the Nihilists refused to recognize any regulation, any moral law, any principle, whether above, external, or within a person as being "absolute." The result was preaching of extreme materialism and individualism, and denial of all "absolute" ethics, of duty and of responsibility, of ideals and of social values.

II

In the meantime, however, the effects of European revolutions of 1848 and the defeats of the Russian armies in the Crimean War (1854–1856) led some of the Russian revolutionary intelligentsia to the belief that the Czarist system was not as invulnerable as generally accepted. These people proposed direct and organized action against the Czarist regime in order to raze it to

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFI Great Russia RFI

the ground together with all its fundamental institutions. Such plans for direct action aimed at total destruction of the existing order were developed by the Anarchists ("Our task is terrible, total, inexorable, and universal destruction".)[7]

Not unlike the Slavophils and the Nihilists, the Anarchists revolted against the existing formal law which was abused for personal gains of those in power. Just as the Nihilists, the Anarchists revolted against the family institution whose sacredness in Russian society often veiled arbitrariness, cruelty, injustices, and humiliations imposed by the elders upon the weak and unprotected. Like the Slavophils and the Nihilists, the Anarchists revolted against private property, the official Church, and the state because these institutions in the Czardom joined hands in supporting the system of serfdom and bureaucratic regimentation. "The only revolution which can do any good to the people is that which destroys, from top to bottom, every idea of the state, overthrowing all traditions, social orders, and classes. . . ."[8]

The Anarchists demanded a return to an anarchic and equalitarian brotherhood that strongly reminds one of the Old-Slavonic world. But following the patriarchal and Czarist traditions of unconditional power and dominance, the Anarchists, just as the Nihilists, usurped for themselves the right to cheat, to steal, to lie, to destroy, and to kill, as a means to do away with "deceit, cunning, exploitation, depravity, vice," of the ruling classes. Said Kropotkin:

> I will be immoral to snap a weapon abused by religion; I will do it, were it only to protest against the hypocrisy imposed on us in the name of a word to which the name morality was given.[9]

"The revolutionary defines as moral only that which assists the revolution, and defines as immoral and criminal that which stands in his way," says the *Catechism of Revolution*. In the same manner, Kropotkin, speaking of the Russian terrorists who assassinated Czar Alexander II, said that "these men and women . . . had conquered the right to kill. . . . 'They have the right to steal' . . ."[10]

In order to be able to destroy, to cheat, and to kill the exploiters and the representatives of the government, it was neces-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

sary to know how to hate them. The Anarchists therefore undertook to find ways by which extreme hatred could best be promoted. This, they said, should be done first by arousing passionate and uncompromising love for equality and freedom and becoming ready to suffer and to sacrifice oneself for these ideas; then by instilling burning hatred and urge of destruction of those who stand in the path of these objectives. "The terrorist," said Stepniak, "is noble, terrible, irresistibly fascinating for he combines in himself two sublimities of human grandeur: the martyr and the hero."[11] Such a revolutionary will "not hesitate to destroy any position, any place, or any man in this world. He must hate everyone and everything with an equal hatred."[12]

Ambivalence of hatred and love and justification of violence for the sake of salvation of others had their roots in the family and were reinforced by conditions in the society at large. Identification with suffering, guilt feelings, desire for martyrdom and self destruction had the same roots and reinforcements. On the ideological level of Anarchism these feelings and attitudes were formulated into principles of thought and action:

> . . . we do not forego our own capacity to love what seems to us good and to hate what seems to us bad. Love and hate, for only those who know how to hate know how to love . . . We only ask one thing, e.c. to eliminate all that impedes the free development of those two feelings in the present society, all that perverts our judgment: the state, the church, exploitation; judges, priests, government, exploiters . . .[13]

But since the primary sources of this ideology and conduct were feelings of rejection, hate and killing took the upper hand over love. Accordingly the Anarchists demanded severance of the relations with the rest of the society and complete dedication to destruction. "The revolutionary has broken all ties with society." He "should have no . . . attachments, no property and no name. All these must be wholly absorbed in the single thought and the single passion for revolution."[14]

Detachment from the rest of the society promoted self-pity and therefore reinforced destructive aggressiveness both against the others and against the self. Renouncement of all ethical, moral or other consideration in dealing with adversaries, pitiless-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

demand for the witches (*vedma*) and wizards (*znakhar*), persons who dealt in black magic. One bought their services both as protection from his enemies and as a means of attack on them. In this manner the dealers in black magic who were a means of protection and attack were also an added threat in life. Some knowledge of defensive and offensive magic became therefore indispensable for everybody.

[152] Destructive urges which developed in such conditions were manifested also in the idea that it was possible for one, if he so wished, to turn into vampire in order to bring evil upon his enemies or to suck their blood. Any wizard or witch by using a spell (*zagovor*) was able to transform a man into a vampire. Such men, transformed into ghost-beasts, would then deal their terrible blows on their enemies, slaking on their victims their thirst for blood.[16]

These same conditions[1] fostered crime, particularly theft, robbery and murder. Some of the sayings, for instance, condone theft and even robbery, particularly if they were done cleverly and the perpetrators escaped being caught. That crime was not only a means of personal gain but also a means of protest against existing conditions is witnessed by those folk proverbs which rationalize or justify theft on the ground that those from whom it was stolen were likely to be much more guilty than the thieves themselves. "He who stole sinned once; those from whom it was stolen sinned ten times." The same motivation might be seen in the inclination to put the blame on the informers more than on the thieves. "Not he who steals, but he who leads is a thief," they would say.[17] Backed by such philosophy of life and favored by existing conditions, crime became widespread. And since in that society force was identified with law, violence was often justified as a means to secure the property of others, especially in times of war. "What is taken by force is sacred," the people would say.

Since the conditions in the patriarchal family and in the stratified local community fostered destructive aggression, and since violence was widely used by all the authorities, the peasant manifested a strong inclination toward violence, whenever this expression of his protest could go unpunished. On the family

[1] [i.e. among the peasants of Tsarist days. Cf. ref. 16, pp. 140-150. Analyst]

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

level violence was manifested in frequent beatings of wife and children, and on the rural community level in habitual drunkenness that often ended in brawls and even murder.[18] In conditions which foster human degradation and lack of trust, both self-seeking and vindictiveness flourish. Hence the Great-Russian peasant was inclined to commit atrocious acts of revenge against people whom he considered as his persecutors or who caused him any harm. When threatening with revenge the Great-Russian peasant was likely to say: "You will pay me with your own blood" (*Ty u menya kroviyu svoey umoeshsya*). Killing as a revenge, burning hay-ricks, barns and homes was a common occurrence. The peasants were likely to organize a collective hunt against real or fancied malefactors and mutilate them or put them to death by means of torture:

> For murder and robbery, death of the culprit—sometimes with mutilation by cutting and tearing off of various parts of his body. For horse-theft and grand larceny they practice sometimes hammering of iron nails into the head and forcing of wooden pins under the nails and also merciless beating even onto death; . . . in some instances the case ends by maiming the thief and letting him go.[19]

At the same time the frontiersmen and professional warriors, such as the Cossacks, became renowned and widely admired because of their deeds of vindictiveness and violence. War was a great opportunity for people with such inclinations. As Gogol has put it, the Cossacks found a great delight in "accumulating booty from raided towns, putting the villages and the fields on fire, and spreading their glories by far and wide throughout the steppe" in order "to revenge themselves for all evil and humiliation."[20] There were numerous robber and Cossack songs which told about such exploits, and expressed desire for vindictiveness and destructive aggression.

Destructive aggression was nursed on the patriarchal family level and reinforced by conditions in the local community. Thus as soon as the controls of the authorities would weaken, mass revolts would come into the open. Such a behavior in turn was used by the local authorities as a justification for their strictness in dealing with the peasants:

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RFl Great Russia RFl

III

Just as in the ideology of Nihilism and Anarchism, revolt against degrading submission and rejection and demand for acceptance in some sects took the form of extreme power-seeking and self-deification. In the sect *Lyudi Bozhii* (people of God), for instance, the craving to become God incarnate or to have a live incarnation of Deity actually present in their midst was so strong that since the time of the sect's founder who claimed to be God Zebaoth (Sabaoth) a whole series of Christs came into being, succeeding one another by a sort of filiation or adoption. Finally each religious community of this sect boasted of having a flesh-and-blood Christ in its midst. They claimed that it was in each man's own power to unite himself to the Deity and to incarnate it in his own body. A woman had the faculty to become *Boginya* (the Goddess) or *Bogoroditsa* (Mother of God) and many women did achieve such self-apotheosis, adding to the number of divinities of each community.[19]

It was by means of suffering and mortification of flesh that candidates for Messiahship competed among themselves for this supreme achievement. These exploits were accompanied with self-glorification. In this way both power-seeking and identification with suffering were realized. The followers would watch for years to see which of the rival pretenders to Christhood underwent the greatest sufferings. The rivals for Godship, on the other hand, often resorted to trickery to prove their claims.[20] But once the issue was settled and a God-incarnate was recognized, the whole congregation owed Him supreme reverence and unconditional obedience which satisfied the contender's craving for power: "I am God, foretold of the prophets. There is no other God than I. Seek ye none other. Where unto ye are appointed, abide therein."[21] On the part of the congregation the desire for Christ-incarnate in their midst manifested a strong need for protective dependence and acceptance.

Hence longing for a world in which truth and justice, kindness and love would reign, in which there would be no abusive serfdom, no subservience, tortures and sufferings, but happi-

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

795
577
771

This is great fortune
For all the servants of the world,
Sharers in honesty and trust,
Executors of the Covenant of Christ.[22]

795
152
[786]

Longing for acceptance was not only manifested in the worship of living "Christ," but also in carnal communion with the "Christs" and "Madonnas," in ecstatic trances and mass religious hallucinations, and apparently even in some cannibalistic practices.[23] Thus when in consequence of sacred rites a Bogorodica would bear a child, if a boy, he was known as *Khristosik* (the little Christ). According to some students of Russia's religious life the Khristosik was immolated on the eighth day after his birth. His heart and blood, mixed with flour and honey, were served to make the cakes for the Eucharist. This practice was called "Taking Communion in the blood of the Lamb."[24] At other times, according to the same sources, it was a young virgin, chosen as Mother of God who willingly gave her left breast to be cut out amidst ritual dancing and singing. The breast was then partaken of as the "true Eucharistic food."[25]

[782]

Great emotional insecurity and extreme fear of rejection might explain why elements of power-seeking were present in all sects, even in those which professed complete repudiation of power in any form whatsoever. For instance, Popov, the founder of the Molokane sect which originally professed complete freedom of conscience and complete equality, eventually entirely suppressed liberty of discussion and interpretation. Unconditional submission to the authorities he declared to be the first duty, insubordination the greatest sin.[26] Andrey Selivanov, the founder of the Skoptsy sect, had himself designated in the prayers which were addressed to him in his lifetime, as "God of Gods and King of Kings," even though the Skoptsy sect professed complete freedom from any form of coercion.[27]

795
621

Also early in the history of the Dukhobortsy we find that their communistic practices finally led to dictatorship and despotism.[28] The leaders of this sect knew how to take personal advantage of the longing of the sect members for protective dependence and acceptance. One of the leaders of this sect, Kapustin, in the beginning of the nineteenth century expounded

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

ended in a violent and mysterious way and a number of pretenders arose to take its place. It was in this interval between the fall of the former authority and the relative consolidation of a new one that the oppressed strata of the Czardom saw an opportunity to rebel against a state of humiliating bondage and economic misery. Seeking relief from their burdens and yearning for social acceptance in a system of equalitarian relationships, the poorer burghers, homeless Cossacks and runaway peasants and slaves flocked into the camp of Bolotnikov, himself an ex-slave and adventurer who marched at the head of this strange army upon Moscow. From his camp near Moscow he distributed proclamations inviting slaves and serfs to slay their masters, commanding all of his followers to rise against the voevodas and others in authority, and exciting them to rob and beat traders. In return he promised the slaves and serfs the wives and the property of the serf-owners. To all his followers he pledged honors, riches and the status of boyars.[2]

Search for security in a system of protection-dependence relationships manifested itself in a need for pretenders. If only a rumor started about the appearance of a pretender, whole provinces would rise to greet him. Sometimes a pretender had to be subsequently found to lead these masses of discontents who rose to follow a fancied liberator and benefactor. Such conditions only contributed to the prolongation of the troubled times and prevented an early establishment and consolidation of a new authority. It was in such a way that most of the seventeenth century became a century of riotings and rebellions which climaxed in the great rising under Stanka Razin in 1670–1671. Originating among the Don Cossacks, this movement soon spread to the Volga regions and developed into a general war of the lower strata against the upper classes. In this, as in the other uprisings of that century, many excesses were committed by both the rebels and the government forces. The same features of social struggle were repeated in the eighteenth century, in the great peasant rebellion that was led by Pugachev, another Cossack chieftain.

Also the nineteenth century witnessed a number of peasant rebellions. In the beginning of that century the peasants of the

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

is "perfected until there are no shortcomings." Then on members of such a group one can make great demands.[33] They will be disciplined, enduring, courageous and faithful. Work will become "second nature" to them; they will not abhor hard effort, nor be afraid of "healthy sweat."[34] They will be industrious and efficient and will develop the "best and most worthy feelings of man," that is, devotion to labor, heroism in the struggle against the forces of reaction, untiring, ruthless and unwavering vigilance against the survivals of capitalism, and an irreconcilable attitude toward the slightest manifestations of deviationism.[35]

III

In the days of Czardom the system of economic and political regimentation found its support in religious sanction and in nationalism. In a like manner the Bolsheviks had early realized that great privations which their regime demands could be best elicited from their subjects with the help of an identification with the great, the absolute, the sublime. It is by such means that traditional cravings for attachment and acceptance could be satisfied. In such a manner also a sense of guilt and urge for self-sacrifice could be reinforced and employed for political purposes.

It is along such efforts that the Bolsheviks have revived and strengthened the traditional Russian images of God, Czar, Father and Mother and have projected these images to the Leader and to the Party. The likeness to God and religion is manifested in the Bolshevik claim of infallibility of their leaders, universality, eternity, and sanctity of their doctrines. Lenin's teachings, for instance, are extolled by the Bolsheviks as being "superior" to any other ideology, as embracing the whole of humanity, and as living forever:

> Lenin's thoughts represent a superior achievement of the Russian and of the world culture; an eternally living and eternally developing science of society—a fighting banner of the working class—living soul of the Bolshevik Party which led our Fatherland to the avant-garde of the whole human kind.
>
> The books of the vozhd and teacher are immortal. They live and

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

208 186 therefore imperative from the point of view of the survival of the Soviet power and self-perpetuation of the ruling faction to find new mass identifications and symbols. These were readily found in ideas of grandeur and perfection, and in ethnocentrism, rooted in Czarist traditions, in Slavophilism and in the Third [152] Rome ideology. These feelings and attitudes were reinforced in the structure of Soviet society in which, just as in the Czardom, dependency and subservience are likely to foster in the higher strata compensatory feelings of superiority and desire to dominate.

In Bolshevik ideology, however, self-apotheosis expressed in ideas of grandeur and in myths of social and national superiority, and in plans of conquest reached much higher proportions than in the Czardom. Thus the language of Bolshevism became saturated with words and phrases which convey the image of grandeur, perfection, holiness and eternity. Words and phrases, such as grandiose (*velichayshy*), life-giving (*zhivotvoryashchy*), invincible (*nepobedimy*), the most perfect (*naybolie soversheny*), limitless (*bezgranichny*), legendary (*bogatyrsky*), epoch-making, holy (*sviatoy*), miraculous (*chudotvorny*), immortal (*bessmertny*) and eternal (*vechny*) are regularly used to depict the achievements of the Soviet state. The Soviet state is referred to as the "magnificent Soviet State," as "the most perfect political form of power" which has already achieved "world-wide historical victories," and still contains "inexhaustible possibilities." There is today no such force "which could surpass its might."[44] Such a mighty and powerful Socialist state "shows a profound influence on the whole international life, on the hearts and minds of all liberty loving people," thus initiating a "new era in the history of human kind."[45]

The Soviet people themselves are said to be unique and to excel in their personal qualities. The Soviet man, as pictured by the Communist press has in every respect attributes superior to the man of any other society. Having "unheard-of opportunities for education," he is said to be at the head of all "progressive humanity." It is pointed out that he is the one who possesses "the only correct orientation" and absolute knowledge of the past, present and future given him by the Marxist-Leninist ideology.

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

pected to help the Party "at all times," there is always a possibility of conflict between the demands of the Party and those of the family. Also, owing to a great shortage of manpower and a very low standard of living, most women, with the exception of those from the upper ruling strata, are forced to work long hours outside the home. Many of them have to engage in heavy physical labor. Such mothers are not only physically exhausted at the end of the day, but are often disillusioned, bitter, as well as critical of the system, a fact which is confirmed by a rather high percentage of women in convict labor camps. Such mothers cannot pay sufficient attention to their children.

At the same time great demands and responsibilities placed on parents in regard to the discipline of their children and the interference of the Party and the government in family affairs often causes harshness in treatment of children. Hence overstrictness as well as negligence of children is the result.[24] Such a situation favors both feelings of rejection and revolt, as well as extreme self-concern and destructive aggressiveness on a larger scale and in a more intense way than in the days of Czardom. And since the Soviet system of vigilance encourages family members to inform on one another, mutual suspicions, fears, and hostilities rooted in patriarchal traditions are greatly magnified. Training in self-confidence and trust, and in group attachment cannot thrive in such circumstances. But it is exactly self-concern, mistrust, and destructive aggression that are so instrumental in the perpetuation of the Bolshevik rule.

Unstable political and economic conditions, together with consequences of wars, depletion of rural areas of adult men, famines, convict labor camps to which millions of parents have been confined, have resulted in an unprecedented number of broken families and a growing number of neglected, illegitimate and delinquent children. A number of such children, especially orphans of war heroes, at the age of nine are sent to military schools. Many neglected and delinquent children at the age of 3 to 13 are sent to special homes for children which are in charge of the secret political police.[25] The increasing stress on internal vigilance, together with the pressing need of the political police to feed their vast economic enterprises with cheap

6; Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

one's helplessness, feeling of rejection, and dependence upon the controlling power is especially keenly felt. In such conditions even a slight deviation might provoke a feeling of guilt, need for self-punishment and suffering; it might call for public self-humiliation, confession of errors and pledges to repent and to correct the wrong done, especially when such practices are supported by the inherited traditions. There is therefore a certain degree of truth in the assertion of the Bolsheviks, that "Criticism and self-criticism is a great driving force in the development of Soviet society."[10]

II

In a "prison and barracks" society privileges of power and ideas of grandeur do not sufficiently compensate for lack of acceptance, isolation, humiliations, feelings of insecurity, and sense of inferiority and rejection. In an atmosphere of suspicion, intrigue, degradation, and lack of intimate personal and intellectual contact and of social support, anxieties, fears, extreme self-concern, and deep antagonisms easily flourish. Such a situation tends to magnify feelings of destructive aggression developed on the family level and is therefore likely to become overcharged with extreme hostilities and hatreds; it is likely to become full of potential explosiveness which may be directed against the ruling class itself unless convenient channels for discharge of aggressiveness are found.

In a society in which overt expressions of emotional behavior are under the control of a ruling clique, accumulating aggressions are readily directed against internal and external "enemies" of the regime, be they real or invented for the occasion. In this manner the feeling of hostility against the regime might be redirected against its opponents. It is therefore in the interest of survival of the ruling faction in such a society to cultivate hatred and destruction of the "enemy" by all means of public pressure, propaganda, agitation, education, as well as lawmaking.

These are the reasons why attitudes of extreme animosity against the "enemies of the Soviet Motherland" are propagated in the Soviet daily press and in the school textbooks. Stirring hatreds is one of the main tasks of Party agitators.[11] Accordingly

6: Tomasic · E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

in the political philosophy expressed in Soviet writings and in the speeches of outstanding Party members, extreme hatred of the internal and external adversaries is considered as a precondition of Bolshevik victory and of survival of Soviet society. Thus, for instance, in a May Day Order of the Day, Stalin, as People's Commissar of Defense declared: "You cannot defeat any enemy without having learned to hate him with all the power of your soul." In Soviet writings Lenin is hailed as a man who had "a holy hatred of the oppressors of the people . . . "[12]

Just like the Anarchists before them, the Bolsheviks claim that a deliberate cult of hatred is a precondition for the development of a "revolutionary passion." They justify hatred as a means to achieve their revolutionary goals. Following the same traditions the Bolsheviks insist that fanatical devotion should be instilled in people as a means to arouse passionate hatred. Therefore deliberate cultivation of hate together with the training in extreme identification with the Leader, the Party, the Motherland, and the Communist cause must start with kindergarten and with school training of Soviet children. Passionate hatred and passionate love are expected to mutually strengthen each other. According to pedagogical teachings, the Soviet children should be "saturated with irreconcilable hatred toward the enemies of socialist society," as well as with "passionate love of the Motherland." But here too just as in the Anarchist precepts, hatred appears to take the first place and love the second:

> Hatred gives birth to class revolutionary vigilance and creates a feeling of irreconcilability toward the class enemy; the weakening of such vigilance undermines the cause of the socialist revolution. It is necessary to learn, not only to hate the enemy, but also to struggle with him, in time to unmask him and finally, if he does not surrender, to destroy him . . . to vanquish the enemy is impossible without the most burning hatred of him . . . Passionate love of the motherlands breeds inevitably strong hatred of the enemy.[13]

Many outstanding Soviet novelists in their writings emphasize this cult of destructive aggression. Maxim Gorki, for instance, wrote an essay entitled "If the enemy does not surrender, he must be destroyed." Konstantin Simonov, another outstanding Soviet

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

author, wrote a well known poem under the title *"Ubey ego"*—kill him.[14] In a similar manner Alexey Tolstoy, a well-known Soviet novelist, has published an essay entitled *Ubey Zverya*—Kill the Beast. "Kill him," writes Alexey Tolstoy, "that is your sacred command."[15] Mikhail Sholokhov, another prominent Soviet writer, wrote a pamphlet entitled *Nauka Nenavisti*—The Science of Hatred—in which he stressed, in a like way as the early Russian Anarchists and contemporary Soviet pedagogists, the necessity of ardent love for the Cause as a source of passionate hatred of all the opponents. To him, too, love seems to be necessary primarily as a means of hate.[16] "Hatred for enemies of the land of socialism is an inseparable feature of socialist ideology and the ideology of Leninism," the Bolsheviks repeatedly say.

Under the label "enemies" are classed not only the foreign "capitalists, imperialists, and reactionaries," and internal non-Party oppositionists, but also Party members who deviate from Party ideology, and "all sceptics, opportunists, capitulators, scabs, and traitors." Hatred and struggle against these "enemies" within the Party must be as merciless and ruthless as against external adversaries. This is considered to be imperative in a mortal struggle against the capitalist world:

> The history of the Party . . . teaches us that unless the Party of the working class wages an uncompromising struggle against the opportunists within its own ranks, unless it smashes the capitulators in its own midst . . . it cannot perform its role of organizer and leader of the proletarian revolution . . . If, while it is carrying on a life and death fight against the bourgeoisie, there are capitulators and traitors on its own staff, within its own fortress, the working class will be caught between two fires, from the front and the rear. Clearly such a struggle can only end in defeat.[17]

This conscious fomenting of intense hostility and animosity against internal, as well as external "enemies" as a means of survival in a "mortal struggle" is manifested in the language of Bolshevism. The words "liquidation" and "purge" which are often synonomous with killing and extermination of opponents became outstanding in Soviet vocabulary. There is an increasing use of words which convey ideas of hatred and violence and stimulate such feelings and practices. In Bolshevik stereotyped termi-

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

nology opponents are referred to as the "enemies of the people." They are said to be "groups of spies," "traitors to the country," "dregs of humanity," "fiendish criminals," "pigmies," "useless rubbish," "hordes of barbarians," "hangmen," "cannibals," "enemies of humankind."[18] These "instruments of oppression of the proletariat," full of "falsehoods and perverse lies," "narrow-minded petty-bourgeois with sickly mentality," have to be mercilessly "smashed," "annihilated," "crushed," "destroyed" with an "ever greater frenzy and ferocity."[19] They have to be "cleansed" from the Soviet society in order to ensure the consolidation of the rule of the Bolsheviks.

It was in order to justify ruthlessness in dealing with the opposition that labelling, denouncing and name-calling has become prominent in Bolshevik practices. Any softness toward the "enemies" is denounced as bourgeois "sentimentalism."[20] Instead, *besposhchadnost* (mercilessness), *surovost* (ruthlessness), *besstrashie* (fearlessness), and *zheleznaya volia* (iron will) are said to be the "Lenin ways" by which the political workers are to deal with all the "opponents, slackers, and deviants."

If in this "life and death fight," ruthlessness, pitilessness, and mercilessness have to be applied then also cunning, guile, craft, ruse and deceit are equally welcome as useful means. Lenin is often quoted as saying that the Communists, when necessary, must "resort to strategy and adroitness, illegal proceedings, reticence and subterfuge,"[21] that they must use any trick and veiling of truth; that they must dodge and maneuver. They must be ready in the interest of final success to suffer humiliation and self-abasement. In the interest of the cause and of final victory, they must know how to retreat and how to "crawl in the mud on their bellies."[22] According to the Bolshevik teaching, there is not an "absolute ethic." Every act is measured by how it corresponds to the interests of the group.[23]

III

Emphasis on extreme hatred, on ruse, and on mercilessness against those who do not conform is not new in the history of Russian society. Destructive aggression formed an aspect of the Czarist rule; it was manifested in the persecution of religious

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

dissenters, in the civil wars as well as in the struggle between the Czarist police and the revolutionary intelligentsia; it was even formulated as an ideology and became a credo of Anarchism.

In the Bolshevik ideology this anti-humanism is justified by representing the "enemies" as not being human beings. Just as in the folk attitudes toward enemy aliens, the oppositionists and the adversaries, actual and potential, real and imaginary, are identified in Bolshevik writings with "gnats," "insects," "reptiles," "dogs," "wild beasts," and "beasts of prey." It is by such ways of reasoning that the Soviet pedagogists have come to the assertion that indoctrination of the people with "burning hatred" of the enemy does not contradict the ideas of humanism, because, they claim, the ideas of humanism and humane feelings do not apply to beasts. In this manner even acts of cruelty toward the "enemies" are condoned and encouraged:

> Hatred of the enemies of the socialist Motherland by no means contradicts the principles of humanism, since it is devoted to the protection of the rights and liberty of the worker from the designs of beasts of prey.[24]

The need for such an appeal to extreme animosities against the adversaries is in itself an indication of instability of the Bolshevik system. The ruling faction had to resort to such a means in order to promote complete identification with and fanatical devotion to the Cause and to the Leader. Here, however, we see a noticeable difference between the Czardom and the Soviet Russia. Though the Czarist system often exhibited aspects of extreme ruthlessness, the whole ideological and intellectual development of the Czarist Russia, especially in the last century of its existence, was in the direction of increasing Westernization and humanization. This trend coincided with certain gains in the field of personal, economic, and cultural freedoms in the Czardom.

As a result terrorism and acts of violence, though widely practiced, were not openly advocated as official Czarist policy. Many moderate and conservative factions of the intelligentsia strongly denounced all acts of terror performed either by the government or under the auspices of the revolutionary intelligentsia. One

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

of human lives. Soviet military policies are little concerned about systematic rotation of units, facilities for recreation, short leaves and furloughs, regular correspondence with home folks, or with the development of techniques to avoid exposure of men to unnecessary risks.[27] As a result of such attitudes the toll of a Soviet division in war time might come up to 90 percent of its men.[28] Even more indifference is shown toward men who were made prisoners, since "they had surrendered and could not fight any more."[29]

IV

Destructive aggressiveness might become self-destructive unless turned outward. Hence constant internal pressure, intrinsic to Soviet power structure, for aggression against the outside world. A policy of external aggressiveness is likely to provoke external threats against which the accumulating hostilities of the subjects can be mobilized. Successful external aggression is also a convenient way to bolster the prestige of the ruling class and to solidify its rule. The policy of aggression against the outside world implies also the urgency to enhance external security should the policy of expansion provoke international complications.

Early in the development of Bolshevik rule the Communist International and the Communist parties throughout the world have been regimented and employed as instruments of this policy of external expansion, as well as a means of defense against external pressures. It was in accordance with such a trend of events that the Program of the Communist International of 1928, as well as the Seventh World Congress of the Communist International of 1935,[30] emphasized complete identification of the world proletariat with the Soviet power:

> Our road is the road of revolution of the peoples against the oppressors and exploiters. Our will is the will of Marx, Engels, Lenin and Stalin. Our goal is socialism for the whole of humanity. Our main slogan is the establishment of Soviet power.[31]

In accordance with such need for outward aggression as a relief of internal destructive tensions an ideological distinction

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

establish the strictest military discipline within its own ranks. The experience of the Russian Communist Party . . . has proved that the victory of the worker is impossible without a severe discipline . . . and unconditional subordination of subordinate units to the decision of those above them, and a strong Party central organ, whose decrees are binding upon all the leaders of Party life . . .[36]

In this manner, the principles of absolute dominance, unconditional obedience and ruthless discipline rooted in the political traditions of Russian society and reinforced by the structure of Bolshevik power were extended to all the parties on which the Bolsheviks imposed their control. In the same manner, also, the traditional filial attitudes of reverence, gratitude, love and humility have been established in relations of these parties to the Communist Party of the Soviet Union. Accordingly also, destructive aggression became one of the fundamental orientations of these parties. The Communist parties have been encouraged to use all means at their disposal, "including force of arms" in order "to overthrow the international bourgeoisie,"[37] and to "lay low the exploiters . . . completely defeat them . . . crush their resistance. . . ."[38]

As a result, the language of these parties, like that of Bolshevism, stresses hatred, destruction and war. For instance, in the Theses and Statutes and in the Program the emphasis is on extreme hostility expressed in many stereotyped phrases, such as "hatred and relentless aggression," "pitiless struggle," "persistent and merciless denunciation," "merciless contempt," "stubborn, armed and ruthless fight," "fierce and decisive battles," "ruthless war." These means against the "mortal enemy" are said to be necessary in order "to destroy the apparatus of the bourgeoisie," and to bring about the "violent overthrow" of bourgeois power, "at whatever cost." Each Communist party is expected to foster hatred and destructive aggression by all means of propaganda and agitation. The Communist press in all countries and popular Communist songs are especially significant in this respect.

Since the Communist parties outside the Soviet Union, just as the Bolshevik Party itself, stress hatred, pitilessness and destruction, they tend to attract into their ranks people who for one

6: Tomasic E-4 (1947-1948) 1953 RF1 Great Russia RF1

reason or another feel rejected, non-accepted, humiliated, oppressed or ostracized in their own society and who find in these parties an opportunity to vent their accumulated grievances and pent-up hostilities. But they also tend to attract people who for idealistic and humanistic reasons seek Utopias of all-human brotherhood. They attract ambitious and talented intellectuals and semi-educated people who have been thwarted in their professional and political expectations; also intellectuals and semi-intelligentsia with mediocre abilities but strong urges for self-assertion and desire for leadership and domination. They also attract many patriots belonging to oppressed nationalities or races, who have identified themselves with their nation, race or ethnic and cultural minority and seek acceptance of their group in a Communistic millenium. In times of social upheavals these parties attract also many adventurers, criminals, vagabonds, and other deviants and offenders.

It is, however, people overcharged with destructive aggression who in these parties tend to climb toward the top levels of Party leadership, because it is such people to whom the Party offers great opportunities for their destructive urges and who therefore tend to be unconditionally loyal to Moscow as contrasted to the more moderate and more humane and patriotic elements, who for one reason or another might not want always to accept Moscow's dictate. As a result of such internal conditions the history of all Communist parties has been a history of internal intrigues, splits, purges, and frequent bloodshed which in turn made it easier to completely subdue these organizations to the will of the Kremlin:

> . . . those who disorganize the Party are to be flayed without mercy. Championing as we do working class unity, we shall with so much more energy and irreconcilability fight for unity within our Parties. There can be no room in our Parties for factions, or for attempts at factionalism. Whoever will try to break up the iron unity of our ranks by any kind of factionalism will get to feel what is meant by the Bolshevik discipline that Lenin and Stalin have always taught us (applause) . . . *The Party is above everything else!* (Loud applause) To guard the Bolshevik unity of the Party as the apple of one's eye is the first and highest law of Bolshevism![88]